

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LATIEF S. YOUNG,

Petitioner,

v.

D.F. OBERLANDER,

Respondent.

Civil Action

No. 21-cv-2600

ORDER

AND NOW, this 25th day of May, 2023, upon consideration of a Report and Recommendation that Petitioner Latief Young's Petitioner for a Writ of Habeas Corpus be denied (ECF No. 30), to which no objection was filed,¹ it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 30) is **ADOPTED**.
2. The Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 2) is **DENIED**. There is no basis to issue a certificate of appealability.
3. The Clerk of Court shall mark this case closed.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Mitchell S. Goldberg
MITCHELL S. GOLDBERG, J.

¹ On January 27, 2023, Young requested an extension until February 7, 2023 to file objections, which was granted, but Young did not file objections. Although a district judge is only required to review "those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made," 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), I have reviewed the Report and Recommendation and determined it to be correct. See Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987).